

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments and amendments submitted herein incorporate the patentability arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during the phone interview on December 18, 2006. Applicants submit that the arguments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. The Examiners said they would reconsider the rejection in view of the arguments presented herein.

Applicants amended claim 5 to depend from claim 1 to overcome the Examiner's objection on pg. 2 of the Office Action.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17 as anticipated by Sollich (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,559). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 concern configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement, and require: displaying a list of user-selectable preferences, wherein the user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction; allowing a user to select one of the user-selectable preferences; storing the selected one of the user-selectable preferences; and configuring the code assist function to display the proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user-selectable preferences responsive to a parsing of the partial program instruction statement.

Applicants amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to require that the user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction and that the code assist function is configured to display proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user selectable preferences. These added claim requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 3-4 of the Specification. Applicants further amended claim 1 to replace "method steps" with "operations".

Applicants submit that these amendments include limitations applicants discussed with the Examiners during the phone interview to further distinguish over the cited art. The Examiners indicated they would reconsider the rejection in view of these amendments.

With respect to the pre-amended claims 1, 7, and 13, the Examiner cited col. 6, lines 11-12 and col. 7, lines 25-45 of Sollich. (Office Action, pgs. 3, 4-5, and 6). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited col. 6 mentions that a submenu lists choices the user can select. Although the cited col. 6 mentions user-selectable choices, nowhere does the cited col. 6 disclose that this submenu relates to user selectable preferences that provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction. Instead, the cited col. 6 discusses submenu lists and a tool bar providing access to commands from a menu.

The cited col. 7 discusses the features of a code editor referred to as “Code Insight”. The cited functions include a code completion function to display properties, methods and events for a class name from which the user can select. A code parameters function allows the user to view the syntax of a method as the user enters it into the code. A code completion delay function allows the user to set the duration of a pause before a code insight dialog box is displayed. These discussed functions nowhere disclose the claimed user selectable preferences that provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction. Instead, the cited functions are related to code editing operations, but do not concern the claimed user selectable preferences that provide different configurations to configure how the code assist functions displays candidates.

Further, nowhere do the cited cols. 6 and 7 anywhere disclose the added claim requirement of different configurations for configuring how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected user-selectable preferences. The cited col. 7 mentions a code completion delay that allows the user to set the duration of a pause before the code insight dialog box is displayed. However, this “code completion delay” does not disclose or concern the claim requirements of configuring a code assist function to display proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to a configuration provided by the user selected user-selectable preference, where different user selectable preferences provide different configurations for configuring how the code assist function displays the proposed candidates.

During the phone interview, the Examiner noted col. 7, lines 50-63 of Sollich. The cited col. 7, lines 50-63 mentions how code completion is implemented at a user interface level by

displaying a dialog box after the user enters a record or class name followed by a period. Upon user entry of the dot operator, the system displays a dialog box next to the cursor position, shown as the cited dialog 503.

The noted col. 7 discusses the operation of a code assist function to display one of the listed items to add to code. However, nowhere does this noted col. 7 disclose the claim requirements of a user selecting a user selectable preference to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates, where different user selectable preferences provide different configurations for the code assist function to display the proposed candidates.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sollich.

Claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, and 17 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 7 or 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 3, 9, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner cited the “SendPage” variable, shown in box 503 in FIG. 5A(1) as disclosing the claim requirement of a preference for displaying a longer representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pgs. 3, 5, 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited “SendPage” in dialog box 503 is part of a list of properties, methods and events appropriate to a class that the user may select to enter into the code. (Sollich, col. 7, lines 59-63). Nowhere does the cited Sollich disclose that the “SendPage” included in the list comprises the claimed preference for configuring the code assist function to display a longer representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction. Instead, the cited “SendPage” is an item the user may select to add to the code, not the claimed

user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to display longer representations of candidates.

The Examiner cited the “RecvPage” item in the dialog box 503 as disclosing the claim requirement of a preference for displaying a shorter representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pg. 3, 5, 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited “RecvPage” in dialog box 503 is part of a list of properties, methods and events appropriate to a class that the user may select to enter into the code. (Sollich, col. 7, lines 59-63). Nowhere does the cited Sollich disclose that the “RecvPage” included in the list comprises the claimed preference for configuring the code assist function to display a shorter representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction. Instead, the cited “RecvPage” is an item the user may select to add to the code, not the claimed user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to display longer representations of candidates.

Accordingly, claims 3, 9, and 15 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Claims 5, 11, and 17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a lower-case representation of a program instruction candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement, a preference for displaying an upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement, and a preference for displaying a leading upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner cited the “var” item in dialog box 503 of FIG. 5A(1) as disclosing a preference for displaying a lower-case representation of a program instruction candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pgs. 4, 5, 7).

The cited “var” indicates a variable. (Sollich, col. 11, lines 58-61). Thus, the cited “var” in dialog box 503 indicates that the listed items are variables or variable arguments. Nowhere does the cited Sollich disclose that the “var” included in the list comprises the claimed preference for displaying a lower-case representation of a program instruction candidate

responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. Instead, the cited “var” identifies an item the user may select to add to the code, not a user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to the display candidates in lower case.

The Examiner the “SMTP1” item in the dialog box 503 as disclosing a preference for displaying a upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pgs. 4, 5, 7).

The cited “SMTP1” is one of the list of properties, methods and events appropriate to a class that the user may select to add to the code. (Sollich, col. 7, lines 59-64). Nowhere does the cited Sollich disclose that the “SMTP1” included in the list comprises the claimed preference for displaying a upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. Instead, the cited “SMTP1” identifies an item the user may select to add to the code, not the claimed user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to the display candidates in upper case.

The Examiner cited the “Top, Right, Bottom,...” items displayed in box 513 as disclosing the claim requirement of a preference for displaying a leading upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pgs. 4, 5, 7).

The cited “Top, Right, Bottom” elements in dialog 513 are members appropriate to select for a record structure to complete entry of an expression. (Sollich, col. 8, lines 11-17) Nowhere does the cited Sollich disclose that the “Top, Right, Bottom” elements included in the list 513 comprise the claimed preference for displaying a leading upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. Instead, the cited “Top, Right, Bottom” identifies an item the user may select to add to the code to complete an expression, not the claimed user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to the display candidates with a leading upper-case syntax representation.

Accordingly, claims 5, 11, and 17 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

2. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Sollich.

Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, these dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 8, and 14 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner cited col. 7, lines 50-63 and dialog box 503 as teaching the claim requirement of a preference for displaying a longer list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. (Office Action, pgs. 7, 9, and 11). Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 7 mentions that a dialog box lists the properties, methods and events appropriate to a class the user may select to add to the code. Nowhere does the cited col. 7 teach that the elements in the list 503 comprises a preference for displaying a longer list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement. Instead, the cited box 503 shows items the user may select to add to the code, not the claimed user selectable preference used to configure the code assist function to the display candidates in a longer list.

The Examiner found that it would be obvious to modify these claims to further require that the user-selectable preferences further includes a preference for displaying a shorter list of candidates. Applicants traverse because the Examiner has not cited any part of Sollich teaching or suggesting different user-selectable preferences that are used to configure a code assist function to display candidates according to the configuration. Instead, the cited box 503 comprises items the user may select to add to code, not the claimed user selectable preferences that may be used to configure how the code assist function displays candidates, i.e., not a user selectable preference to control how the cited box 503 is displayed.

Accordingly, claims 2, 8, and 14 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, and 18 provide specific additional user-selectable preferences that may be selected to configure how the code assist function displays candidates to complete a partial program instruction. For these claims, the Examiner cited the same sections of Sollich concerning the dialog box 503 discussed above. As discussed, this cited dialog box 503 comprises items the user may select to add to code, not the claimed user selectable preferences that may be used to configure how the code assist function displays candidates. In other words, the Examiner has not cited any part of Sollich that teaches or suggests that the box 503 has user-selectable preferences, including the specific claimed preferences, used to configure how the code assist function displays candidates.

Accordingly, claims 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-18 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: December 18, 2006

By: /David Victor/

Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984